

Appl. No. 10/604,722
Amdt. Dated November 3, 2004
Reply to Office action of August 05, 2004

REMARKS**1. Objections to the claims:**

5 Claim 7 is amended to eliminate the "liquid crystal panel" limitation, which is placed into new claim 17 that is dependent on claim 1. New claim 17 should not warrant a new search or additional consideration since it is clear that the examiner has already fairly considered the "liquid crystal panel" limitation
10 in the current rejections on the merits.

Claim 12 is amended to recite "predetermined angle" rather than "acute angle".

15 Claim 15 has been cancelled.

No new matter is entered by any of these amendments. Withdrawal of the objections to claims 7 and 12 and consideration of new claim 17 is requested.

20

2. Amendments to claims 1 and 9, cancellation of claims 15-16, and introduction of claims 18-19:

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate all limitations of dependant
25 claim 3. Accordingly claim 3 is cancelled and claims 4 and 5 are amended to correct dependency. No new matter is entered.

Claim 9 is amended to incorporate all limitations of dependant claim 10. Accordingly claim 10 is cancelled and claim 11 is
30 amended to correct dependency. No new matter is entered.

Appl. No. 10/604,722
Amdt. Dated November 3, 2004
Reply to Office action of August 05, 2004

Claims 15-16 are cancelled.

5 Claims 18 and 19 are introduced to further clarify a refinement of the invention. The limitation "immediately adjacent" is meant to convey that there are no intermediate optical elements. These claims should not warrant a new search or additional consideration since they are dependent claims and since the disclosure clearly shows this arrangement.

10

3. Rejection of claims 1, 2, 8, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Shikama (US 5,671,993) :

15 Shikama teaches a condenser lens 131 that may be coated with ultraviolet/infrared-light reflecting material (Fig.58a-b, col. 34, lines 49-53). The examiner has considered the condenser lens 131 to be the "invisible-light reflector" of claims 1, 2, 8, 15, and 16.

20 Reconsideration of claims 1, 2, and 8 is requested in view of the amendment to claim 1.

4. Rejection of claims 1, 2, 8, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Kobayashi (US 6,111,700) :

25

Kobayashi teaches a UV-cut filter 302 (302a and 302b) that reduces UV light to the system (see Fig. 71, col. 37, lines 10-22). The examiner has considered the filters 302a and 302b to be the "invisible-light reflector" of claims 1, 2, 8, 15, and 16.

30

Appl. No. 10/604,722
Amdt. Dated November 3, 2004
Reply to Office action of August 05, 2004

Reconsideration of claims 1, 2, and 8 is requested in view of the amendment to claim 1.

5 **5. Rejection of claims 1, 2, 6-9, and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Li (US PAP 2003/0063261):**

10 Li teaches an infrared reflector 886 (see Fig.8). The examiner has considered the reflector 886 to be the "invisible-light reflector" of claims 1, 2, 6-9, and 13-16. While the examiner has stated that the reflector is at 0 degrees, from Fig.8 it appears that it is actually at 90 degrees.

15 Reconsideration of claims 1, 2, 6-8 is requested in view of the amendment to claim 1.

Reconsideration of claims 9, 13, and 14 is requested in view of the amendment to claim 9.

20 **6. Rejection of claims 3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shikama in view of Kobayashi:**

25 Shikama teaches a condenser lens 131 that may be coated with ultraviolet/infrared-light reflecting material (Fig.58a-b, col. 34, lines 49-53). The examiner has considered the condenser lens 131 to be the "invisible-light reflector" of claim 1 (which now contains the limitations of claim 3).

30 The applicant argues that the examiner has not fully considered the effects of tilting the condenser lens 131 of Shikama.

Appl. No. 10/604,722
Amdt. Dated November 3, 2004
Reply to Office action of August 05, 2004

Kobayashi teaches two filters 302a and 302b, one of which is tilted with respect to the other. Kobayashi does not teach or suggest a tilted condenser lens. Thus, given Shikama and
5 Kobayashi one of ordinary skill in the art could not anticipate the effects of tilting the condenser lens 131. For example, tilting Shikama's lens 131 may or may not reduce the leakage of UV light, a detailed optical analysis would have to be performed since filters and condenser lenses are known to behave quite
10 differently. The requirement for such an analysis is not conducive to obviousness. Moreover, tilting the condenser lens 131 would require numerous modifications to many other optical components in Shikama's Fig.58a-b, such as the placement of the mirrors 11a-d, and such modifications are neither taught nor
15 suggested in Shikama or Kobayashi. Hence, there is inadequate motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to make this combination, and furthermore, this combination may even unpredictably affect the way Shikama's device operates.

20 The applicant requests that the amended claim 1 and all dependants be reconsidered in view of the above argument.

**7. Rejection of claims 3-5 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li as applied to claims 1 and 9 above
25 and further in view of Kobayashi:**

Li teaches an infrared reflector 886 (see Fig.8). The examiner has considered the reflector 886 to be the "invisible-light reflector" of claim 1 (which now contains the limitations of claim
30 3) and claim 9 (which now contains the limitations of claim 10).